UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,739	04/25/2000	KEVIN B. GJERSTAD	1018.099US1	9937

5251	7590	08/17/2004

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON LLP
2555 GRAND BLVD
KANSAS CITY,, MO 64108

EXAMINER
SMITH, PETER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 25 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

<u>PERIOD FOR REPLY</u> [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____ . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

    (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

    (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

    (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

    (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

        NOTE: _____ .

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____ .

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See Continuation Sheet.*

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

    The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

    Claim(s) allowed: _____ .

    Claim(s) objected to: _____ .

    Claim(s) rejected: *1-3,6,9 and 12-20*.

    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: *4,5,7,8,10 and 11*.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ .

10. ☐ Other: _____

JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding Applicant's arguments in pages 7-10 that Saunders and Tung fail to teach the limitations of independent claim 1, the Examiner believes Saunders and Tung allow for greater freedom than the tracking mechanism of claim 1. Saunders teaches in fig. 1, 4-5, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 6 lines 11-67 identifying a range of text and reserving it with a unique identifier so that only a specific handler may operate on the text. In col. 6 lines 55-67, Saunders specifically discusses how other text services are excluded from entering or modifying text in the reserved portion. The Examiner interprets the tracking mechanism of the claimed invention to always exclude any text service other than the original inputting text service for a particular text portion. So, while Saunders does not exactly disclose the tracking mechanism of the claimed invention, Saunders would have been easily modified to create the tracking mechanism by making the identifier of the reserved portion permanent and not allowing a text service to relinquish control of a particular text portion which originally created. The tracking mechanism modification would have been reflected in Saunders in step 86 of fig. 5 wherein the access to a text portion would always be available for the originating text service and would never be available to any other text service. Saunders provides an additional degree of freedom in allowing multiple text services to operate on a specific portion of text albeit at different times. Thus, the Examiner believes the obvious combination of Tung and Saunders does teach the claimed tracking mechanism. Regarding Applicant's argument's in pages 11 and 12 that Saunders, Tung and Covington do not the limitations of claims 6, 9, and 20, the Examiner believes Saunders teaches a mechanism to track entry of text into a document by each handler associates each contiguous range of text entered into the document by a single handler to the single handler in fig. 5, col. 2 lines 17-39, and col. 6 lines 11-67. Saunders shows how selected portion of text may be reserved for a particular text service. Saunders teaches identifying a single handler for a contiguous range of text in fig. 4a, 4b, and 5. Covington teaches attaching a property to a contiguous range of text in the abstract. Covington teaches attaching a permanent identifier which links the selected portion of text to the media event and thus teaches attaching a property. In view of these teachings, the Examiner believes that the combination of Saunders, Tung, and Covington teach the invention in independent claims 6, 9, and 20..